UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,242	05/18/2005	Masuo Koyama	TAD-C560	5781
George A. Loud	7590 10/02/200 <b>1, Esquire</b>	EXAMINER		
BACON & THOMAS Fourth Floor 625 Slaters Lane Alexandria, VA 22314-1176			CHEVALIER, ALICIA ANN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/02/2008	PAPER

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/535,242	KOYAMA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	ALICIA CHEVALIER	1794
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tid d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDON	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and.  Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	rawn from consideration.  /or election requirement.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according to by the Examination 10 and a specific a	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objection.	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Djected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5)  Notice of Informal 6)  Other:	Date

#### RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. Claims 1-13 are pending in the application.

### **REJECTIONS**

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,261,665).

Regarding Applicant's claim 1, Murata discloses a film wherein one surface of the film is matted, and the matted surface shows a wet tension of 25 mN/m, 1mN/m=1 dyne/cm, or higher (col. 10, lines 18-20).

The limitation "fingerprint easily erasable" is a functional limitation and is deemed to be a latent property of the prior art since the prior art is substantially identical in composition and/or structure. MPEP 2145 (II).

Regarding Applicant's claim 3, Murata disclose wherein the film as a whole has a haze of 1.5 to 35.0% (*col. 18, lines 23-25*).

Regarding Applicant's claims 4 10, Murata discloses which comprises a substrate and a resin layer provided on the substrate and has the matted surface as a surface of the resin layer (figures 1-3).

Regarding Applicant's claim 5, the limitation "coating material containing an ionizing radiation curable resin" is a method limitation and does not determine the patentability of the product, unless the process produces unexpected results. The method of forming the product is not germane to the issue of patentability of the product itself, unless Applicant presents evidence from which the Examiner could reasonably conclude that the claimed product differs in kind from those of the prior art. MPEP 2113.

Regarding Applicant's claims 7 and 12, Murata discloses the resin layer contains silica particles as a matting agent (*col. 18, lines 28-36*).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 2, 8, 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata et al. in view of Amimori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,559,915).

Murata is relied upon as described above.

Murata fails to disclose the ten point mean roughness Rz.

Amimori discloses an LCD optical film with an Rz of 1 to 3  $\mu$ m (col. 3, line 60). The film does not lower display brightness (col. 3, lines 30-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the Rz disclosed by Amimori in Murata's film in order to insure display brightness.

5. Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata et al. in view of Hasno et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,716,513).

Murata is relied upon as described above.

Murata fails to disclose the resin layer contains two kinds of matting agents having different average particle diameters.

Hasno discloses a coating for optical displays (col. 4, lines 23-43). The coating contains two kinds of silica particles having different average particle diameters (figure 1 and col. 5, lines 45-63). The coating is antifogging (col. 4, lines 7-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use two kinds of matting agents having different average particle diameters as taught by Hasno in Murata in order to impart antifogging.

### ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant's arguments in the response filed June 24, 2008 regarding the previous rejections of record have been considered but are most since the rejections have been withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Chevalier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1490. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye, can be reached on (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Application/Control Number: 10/535,242 Page 5

Art Unit: 1794

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Alicia Chevalier/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794 10/3/2008